

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

RE: "DOES TEA AFFECT CARDIOVASCULAR DISEASE? A META-ANALYSIS"

Although there are many commonalities regarding the etiology of vascular diseases, commonalities should not be assumed. This point is illustrated in the paper by Peters et al. (1). These authors performed a meta-analysis of tea consumption in relation to stroke and coronary heart disease, and they found that the study-specific effect estimates for stroke and coronary heart disease were too heterogeneous to be summarized. For stroke, the heterogeneity between risk estimates for tea consumption was suggested to be due to either the geographic region (Australia) or the study design. However, because the only case-control study was also the only study from this geographic region, they were unable to suggest which of these two would be the most likely to explain the heterogeneity. Although these are valid hypotheses, there is a more important and plausible explanation for the heterogeneity observed.

Stroke comprises three distinct subtypes: cerebral infarction, subarachnoid hemorrhage, and intracerebral hemorrhage. These subtypes of stroke are not homogeneous but have differing risk profiles (2–4), incidence rates (5), management (6, 7), and outcomes (8–10). All of the studies of stroke used in the meta-analysis (1), with the exception of the Australian case-control study (3), included all three subtypes of stroke. Given that the most common form of stroke is cerebral infarction, usually comprising 73–86 percent of all strokes (5), it is likely that the risk estimates for tea consumption in these studies were largely influenced by the effect of tea consumption on this particular form of stroke. In contrast, the Australian study was undertaken among patients with fatal and nonfatal intracerebral hemorrhage, a less common form of stroke comprising 8–15 percent of all strokes (5). Because of the differing etiology of this type of stroke compared with cerebral infarction, it is plausible that the effect of tea consumption on these two major types of stroke will be different, thus providing an important explanation for the observed heterogeneity between studies. This interesting disparity is certainly worthy of further investigation.

REFERENCES

1. Peters U, Poole C, Arab L. Does tea affect cardiovascular disease? A meta-analysis. *Am J Epidemiol* 2001;154:495–503.
2. Donnan GA, McNeil JJ, Adena MA, et al. Smoking as a risk factor for cerebral ischaemia. *Lancet* 1989;2:643–7.
3. Thrift AG, McNeil JJ, Forbes A, et al. Risk factors for cerebral haemorrhage in the era of well-controlled hypertension. *Stroke* 1996;27:2020–5.
4. Thrift AG, McNeil JJ, Forbes A, et al. Three important subgroups of hypertensive persons at greater risk of intracerebral haemorrhage. *Hypertension* 1998;31:1223–9.

5. Sudlow CLM, Warlow CP. Comparable studies of the incidence of stroke and its pathological types: results from an international collaboration. *Stroke* 1997;28:491–9.
6. Schievink WI. Intracranial aneurysms. *N Engl J Med* 1997;336:28–40.
7. Tissue plasminogen activator for acute ischemic stroke. The National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke rt-PA Stroke Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1995;333:1581–7.
8. Longstreth WT Jr, Nelson LM, Koepsell TD, et al. Clinical course of spontaneous subarachnoid hemorrhage: a population-based study in King County, Washington. *Neurology* 1993;43:712–18.
9. Bamford J, Sandercock P, Dennis M, et al. Classification and natural history of clinically identifiable subtypes of cerebral infarction. *Lancet* 1991;337:1521–6.
10. Anderson CS, Jamrozik KD, Burvill PW, et al. Determining the incidence of different subtypes of stroke: results from the Perth Community Stroke Study, 1989–1990. *Med J Aust* 1993;158:85–9.

Amanda G. Thrift^{1,2} and Geoffrey A. Donnan^{1,3}

¹ National Stroke Research Institute, Austin & Repatriation Medical Centre, West Heidelberg, Australia.

² Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, Monash Medical School, Alfred Hospital, Prahran, Australia.

³ Neurology Department, Austin & Repatriation Medical Centre, Heidelberg, Australia.

THE AUTHORS REPLY

Drs. Thrift and Donnan (1) have pointed out that the heterogeneity among risk estimates for tea consumption and stroke, as described in our meta-analysis (2), might also be explained by differences in subtypes of stroke. To address this valid concern, we divided studies by subtypes of stroke if sufficient information was provided. For only intracerebral hemorrhage did more than one study provide an effect estimate for tea consumption. Whereas one study (3) reported an increased risk of 51 percent for an increment of three cups/day of tea consumption, the other two studies reported decreases of 7 percent (4) and 30 percent (5). The three estimates were not homogeneous ($p = 0.07$). Factors such as study design or geographic region might explain part of this heterogeneity. We agree that it would be helpful for studies of cardiovascular and cerebrovascular events to be more specific and more consistent in their outcome definitions.

REFERENCES

1. Thrift AG, Donnan GA. Re: "Does tea affect cardiovascular disease? A meta-analysis." (Letter). *Am J Epidemiol* 2002;156:490.